

MINUTES

OF THE

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD

13th Meeting, Thursday, 5 November 1953, 4:00 P.M. DCI Conference Room, Administration Building

Present: Messrs. L M 25X1A9a	yman B. Kirkpatrick, Inspector General, Chairman atthew Baird, Director of Training, Member
	Deputy Chief, PP, Member Office of the Inspector General
25X1A9a	, Acting Personnel Director,
25X1A9a 25X1A9a	Alternate for the AD/Personnel, Member Chief of Operations, Alternate
for the DD/P, Member	
L	awrence R. Houston, General Counsel
25X1A9a	cial Assistant to the DD/A AD/Communications, Member
25X1A9a ₩	Chief, Administrative Staff, DD/P untington Sheldon, AD/CI, Member
25X1A9a	Chairman, Legislative Task Force
25X1A9a	for the DD/I, Member
25X1A9a	Executive Secretary . Personnel Office
25X1A9a	Secretariat
25X1A9a	Secretariat , Reporter

- 1. Minutes of the 12th meeting of the CIA Career Service Board, held 29 October 1953, were approved without change.
- 2. The Chairman introduced Tab G, "Tenure, Job Security and Reduction in Force", of the Final Report of the Legislative Task Force, by reading a report of a conversation held between Messrs. James Mitchell, Secretary of 25X1A9aLabor, on 3 November 1953 in which Mr. Mitchell expressed himself on the subject of tenure and job security in government. Mr. Mitchell had advised that in his opinion "tenure" was a will-of-the-wisp but that job security was all important, though intangible, and could be achieved only through a sound personnel policy. (see attached Memorandum 25X1A9a of Conversation.)

 Acting Personnel Director, then discussed a



proposed Agency Reassignment Board. General Cabell had requested that studies for this be made. Informed the Board that the Acting 25X1A9a DD/A would shortly be receiving this proposal for Agency coordination. In the detailed discussion which followed on Tab G, it was pointed out that the complexities of the subject of tenure might require additional study by the Agency prior to decision as to whether legislation was necessary or not. It was suggested that opinions additional to those of Mr. Mitchell be sought, since over the years all other Government career services -- including the Civil Service itself -- had found it necessary, and the Congress had felt it wise, to base the career services, and tenure in them, on statute. It was agreed, however, that enough time at the present had been devoted to this matter and that further studies prior to making recommendations to the Director would not be undertaken. It was further agreed that the title of the paper would be revised by eliminating the word "tenure", so that the title would read, "Job Security and Reduction in Force." It was further agreed that Recommendation 6bl would be revised by the elimination of the phrase "in accordance with the requirements of the Veterans Preference Act so that this recommendation would read, "Develop procedures for reduction in force." With these revisions it was agreed that Tab G stood approved for transmission to the Director with the final recommendations.

3. Tab F, "Restrictions and Obligations on CIA Careerists" of the Final Report of the Legislative Task Force was discussed in detail. the main, the discussion revolved around the principle of service "anywhere, anytime and for any type of duty." While there was general acceptance of the principle in its broadest implications, there was no agreement as to how the principle would be applied. For example, it was pointed out that mandatory assignment was not enforceable in any civilian situation in this country. There were no penalties that could legally be invoked even in a career service as tightly organized as the Foreign Service or the Coast & Geodetic Service. These services had no power to prevent the resignation of a member of the service if he was determined to get out. In wartime and in time of national emergency the resignation of a member of the Armed Forces could be prevented by refusing to accept the resignation. However, in peacetime, a Regular Army or Air or Naval Officer could resign from the service under certain conditions; namely, with the approval of the President. Enforced assignment and enforced duty was technically possible in the Armed Forces only by reason of the existence of the Articles of War. Such a procedure did not and could not apply to a civilian. There was discussion of motivation for career service in CIA and of the undesirability, in the type of activities with which CIA is concerned, of forcing an individual to take an assignment which was unreasonable or unpalatable to him. There was also discussion of the undesirability of opening the question, at least from the point of view of proposed legislation, of obligations as such, since additional obligations, not regarded by CIA as necessary or desirable,

Approved For Release 2000/08/27: CIA-RDP78-00699A000100040015-8



might be imposed on CIA by legislative action. There was discussion of the absolute necessity of creating one career service within CIA, and not separate career services, either for the several components or related to different kinds of activities. It was eventually agreed that the principal opposing points of view would be presented to the Director for resolution and that the Director would be invited to attend a meeting of the Board to hear the presentation and to render his decision.

- 4. The proposed definitions of the CIA Career Service were discussed. It was recognized that while the definition was not prepared primarily for presentation to a Committee of Congress in connection with legislation, it was important because the definition would have to be known to everybody in the Agency and would be constantly referred to for a variety of purposes. It was pointed out that the definition should not be a cold statement of facts but ought to contain, if possible, a feeling of warmth and recognition of the human and intangible factors that are involved in the mission of CIA. Definition A (a statement of the CIA Career Service Program as approved on 13 June 1952) was ruled out as not being a statement of CIA Career Service although some persons felt that certain intangible qualities contained therein could be appended to a definition. Definition B (as proposed by the Legislative Task Force on 13 August 1953) was ruled out since the majority felt that certain factors therein stated were redundant and gratuitous. The remaining factors were combined with Definition C (a new proposal which had attempted to embody the essential elements of A and B). It was agreed that the revision of Definition C made by the Board would be resubmitted for final approval.
- 5. The Chairman announced that the agenda for the next meeting on 12 November 1953 would include Tab E, "Personnel Reserve for the Central Intelligence Agency" and Tab H, "Legislative Provisions for the Organization and Structure for Career Service in CIA." It was also proposed that the Report of the Junior Officer Task Force be considered on Thursday, 19 November 1953 and of the Women's Task Force on Monday, 23 November 1953 (Thursday, 26 November 1953, being a holiday).
- 25X1A9a
- 6. reported briefly on liaison with the Kaplan Committee which is studying the problem of retirement of Government employees. The Kaplan Committee would appreciate hearing the views of CIA on this subject.
 - 7. The meeting was adjourned at 1715 hours.



25X1A9a

Executive Secretary

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-006994000100040015-8

MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSAUTON

25X1A9a

Present: Messrs. James Mitchell, Secretary of Labor;

In Office of Secretary of Labor, 3 Nov 1953, 4:30 - 5:15 P.M.

SUBJECT: Job Tenure and Job Security

1. The purpose of the conversation was to determine from a responsible Government official, not associated with security sensitive affairs, who has had wide experience both in Government and in private employment, and who is a recognized expert in personnel and labor matters, his views respecting job temure and job security. No classified matters were discussed.

Tenure. Mr. Mitchell expressed the view that tenure is a relative matter: that there is no such thing as absolute temure; and that temure either in Government or in civil life was subject to such considerations as administrative necessity, or the desires of Congress, or the condition of the budget, etc. He used the examples that if the Congress decided to wipe out the Department of Labor by legislation, the tenure of all the persons now working in the Department of Labor was worthless; that if the Board of Directors of Macy's should decide to substantially change the operation of Macy's Department Store the tenure of all employees would be substantially affected. He stated that in the past year more than 8,000 commissioned officers in the Armed Forces had been separated, and therefore the tenure of commissioned personnel was also subject to qualifications. The question of applicable law and legislation on the matter of tenure was also discussed, and it was recognized that in Government, Civil Service status conveyed a degree of tenure, while in civil employment tenure of unionized employees was conveyed through the contractual agreements between an employer and the applicable union. Generally speaking, in civilian employment the white-collar worker, the executive, the "intellectual" worker, had no tenure. Tenure could be conveyed by contract which would state the degree of tenure with respect to the time factor as well as to the conditions of employment. This example re-emphasized the fact that tenure as such was relative and conditioned by the terms of the particular tenure that was under consideration. In Mr. Mitchell's view the consideration of tenure was a will-o-the-wisp. He also expressed the view that the weakness of civilian employment of the U.S. Government was that such tenure as existed created a false sense of security, inhibited initiative and stimulated L the retention of adequate though mediocre workers.

3. Job Security.

In Mr. Mitchell's view "job security" was all important, even though it was more of an intengible and, in a sense, similar to "morala". An individual acquired a sense of job security by having confidence that he would not be separated from his job for arbitrary or frivolous reasons. In Mr. Mitchell's view job security was the product of a good, and demonstrated, personnel policy. Three elements are essential: (1) The policy must be detailed and inclusive. All essential factors such as grievance procedures, employee evaluations, promotion for merit, etc., must be present. (2) The policy must be known throughout the organization and thoroughly understood not only by supervisors but by all employees. (3) The employee must have an opportunity to see that the announced policy is actually put into practice. Until an individual has confidence that the announced policy is actually being followed, there can be no feeling of job security.